DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 275 HE 016 261

AUTHOR Hendel, Darwin D.; Solberg, Jeanne
TITLE Sabbatical and Leave Experiences of Female and Male Faculty at a Large Research University.
PUB DATE 14 Apr 83
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Competitive Selection; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Males; *Professional Continuing Education; Released Time; *Sabbatical Leaves; *Sex Differences; Teacher Attitudes; Trend Analysis; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS Research Universities

ABSTRACT

Sex differences in faculty members' use of and evaluation of sabbaticals and leaves taken at a large research university were examined. Attention was directed to sex differences in two faculty programs: a competitive leave program, established in 1954, which awards faculty a leave for one quarter at full pay; and a noncompetitive sabbatical program, established in the early 1900s, which grants faculty sabbaticals for 1 year at half salary. Usable questionnaire responses were obtained from 1,168 tenured faculty at the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota. It was found that a higher percentage of males than females had received both a noncompetitive sabbatical as well as a competitive quarter leave. Despite the variation in percentages of awards to females versus males, institutional records revealed that the percentages of male and female awardees fluctuated considerably from year to year, and no clear trends appeared for the last 15 years. Although male and female faculty who had taken a sabbatical or leave responded similarly in their descriptions of benefits of a sabbatical or leave, male and female faculty who had not taken one differed in their stated reasons for not doing so. The findings are discussed within the context of the potential advantages to the individual and institution of using the leave options. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231275

Sabbatical and Leave Experiences of Female and Male Faculty at a Large Research University[1, 2]

Darwin D. Hendel and Jeanne Solberg

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

University of Minnesota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Darwin D Hendel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 016 261

[1]Paper presented at a symposium "Faculty Characteristics: A Continuing Controversy about Sex Differences" held at the 1983 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association on April 14, 1983 in Montreal, Canada.

[2]The present study was supported, in part, by a grant from the Bush Foundation to the University of Minnesota to provide funds for a special sabbatical program for faculty highly involved with undergraduate education.

Abstract

The present study examines sex differences in faculty members' use of and evaluation of sabbaticals and leaves taken at a large research university. Not surprisingly, males more often than females reported having made use of both options. Institutional records indicate variation in percentages of awards to females versus males, but indicate no clear trends in the last 15 years. Although male and female faculty who had taken a sabbatical or leave responded similarly in their descriptions of benefits of taking a sabbatical or quarter leave, male and female faculty who had not taken one differed in their stated reasons for not doing so. Findings are discussed within the general context of the potential advantages to the individual and institution of utilizing leave options.

Sabbatical and Leave Experiences of
Female and Male Faculty at a Large Research University

Although research on faculty characteristics in higher education has a long history, systematic study of sex differences in higher education is a relatively new area of inquiry. Within the last decade, however, much has been written about sex differences in salary, scholarly productivity, and responsibilities of female versus male faculty in higher education (e.g., Astin & Bayer, 1972; Astin & Hirsch, 1979; Ladd & Lipset, 1976). The study of sex differences in faculty members' use of sabbatical leaves represents an untouched area of inquiry.

One explanation for the absence of research on sex differences in sabbatical experiences is that relatively little evaluative research has focused on sabbatical leaves in spite of their frequency. According to Eberle and Thompson (1973), about two-thirds of the 386 institutions they surveyed offered a sabbatical leave program to their faculty: "...leave programs seem related to institutional age and to tradition in higher education, and their availability appears to fluctuate in terms of faculty supply and demand and institutional finances," (p.6). According to Eels and Hollins (1962), the first sabbatical leave programs in America were established during the last two decades of the nineteenth century.

Several general studies (Cooper, 1931; Eels & Hollins, 1962; Stickler, 1965; Eberle & Thompson, 1973) have addressed the availability of sabbatical leave programs in higher education and have attempted to address the purposes and expected outcomes of sabbatical programs. The first study (Cooper, 1931) of 844 institutions of higher education concluded that sabbatical programs were created primarily for the long-term benefit to institutions of higher education. In the second study (Eels & Hollins, 1962) of the first 48 colleges and universities to establish sabbatical programs, the researchers concluded: "Although many of them indicate that the purpose is to permit study, research, or other forms of improvement of the faculty members, they tend to stress that the ultimate purpose is...increased capacity for usefulness to the university" (p. 19). The third study by Stickler (1965)

found that approximately 70% of state universities and land grant colleges have sabbatical programs. Finally, Eberle and Thompson's (1973) study of 386 institutions concluded that sabbatical leaves were often viewed as a type of fringe benefit and were rarely examined as to their effectiveness.

Numerous other smaller studies have examined the availability and status of sabbatical programs within particular states and higher education systems. Hopson (1972) studied the availability of sabbatical leaves in four-year colleges and universities in New Mexico and found that programs were available in seven of eight institutions studied. Jorgensen (1974) and Le Grand and Swanson (1964) studied the sabbatical policies and practices in California junior colleges, and found that the purposes for which leaves were commonly granted were for advanced study, research, and travel. Johnson's (1980) study of a sample of leave activities in public two and four-year institutions in Washington examined selection criteria, purposes, and procedures for documenting and evaluating leave activities. Findings from this study indicated that the evidence indicated a very direct relationship between the purposes of approved leaves and the institutional responsibilities of leave-taking faculty.

Clearly, the extant research literature on sabbatical leaves documents the existence of programs but only touches the issues of institutional impact and faculty professional development. Eberle and Thompsons' (1973) questionnaire data from administrators at 386 institutions suggests continued support for the sabbatical: 66% considered it to be substantially important, 30% considered sabbaticals to be moderately important, and only 4% said that the sabbatical was of questionable importance. Higher education generally continues to believe in the value of the sabbatical, despite the lack of documentation of its value to the individual faculty member and to the institution.

Relatively little data are available concerning faculty members' perceptions of the role and importance of sabbatical leaves. According to Goeres

(1977) sabbatical leave policies are third in importance to faculty involved in developing a collective bargaining package, following closely to placement and promotion considerations. Bluhm (1976) obtained survey data from 77 faculty at the University of Utah and found no differences between faculty who had taken a leave and eligible faculty who had not taken a sabbatical. Bluhm's findings that one out of ten eligible faculty took a sabbatical and that sabbaticals were most frequently taken by social science and humanities faculties suggest that sabbaticals are underused, especially by faculty in the physical and biological sciences.

The potential value of a sabbatical in a faculty members' professional development is clear. Patton (1981) suggests that institutions need to take a more planful approach by encouraging faculty to prepare three-year plans that include teaching, research, leaves, grants, and other professional development activities. Given the potential value of a sabbatical, Eberle and Thompson (1973) suggest that all faculty eligible for sabbatical should be required to apply or to give reasons for not applying. Finally, studies of an institution's efficiency (Lindsay, 1982) need to document the "outputs" that are directly or indirectly attributable to taking a sabbatical leave.

As we enter the 1980's, issues of faculty professional development, faculty vitality, and faculty productivity become increasingly important given the decline in the number of new faculty and the increase in the average age of an institutions' faculty. Taking a sabbatical leave could become an important event in a faculty member's career. According to Entrekin and Everett (1981) academicians are susceptible to mid-career crises, especially when they enter Erikson's developmental stage of generativity in needing to create something of lasting value. Some faculty, such as the 134 faculty studied by Toombs and Marlier (1981) at Penn State University, may decide to make a mid-career change and leave academe. Other faculty may use a sabbatical

to learn a new discipline in order to resume somewhat different teaching responsibilities when they return. Clearly, institutions of higher education are proposing financial incentives for faculty to leave academe (Palmer & Patton, 1981; Patton, 1978) but are devoting few resources to renewing and restoring faculty for the educational environment of the 1980's.

The present study, part of a larger project designed to collect information about the effects of a sabbatical leave program, focused on sex differences in use of leaves during the past 20 years and sex differences in faculty member's descriptions of sabbatical and leave experiences. The study focused on sex differences in two faculty programs: 1) a competitive leave program, established in 1954, which awards faculty a leave for one quarter at full pay; and 2) a non-competitive sabbatical program, established in the early 1900's, which grants faculty sabbaticals for one year at half salary.

Method

Institutional Records

Unfortunately, institutional records concerning characteristics of faculty recipients of single quarter leaves and sabbaticals are minimal. Although characteristics such as faculty rank, tenure status, age, and sex were available at the time an award was made, trying to reconstruct those records is virtually impossible. Analysis of institutional records focused on sex of the faculty recipient, since award lists are maintained within the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Frequencies of awards to female and male faculty members were obtained starting with 1969-70.

Instrument

We developed a four-page questionnaire "Sabbatical and Single Quarter Leave Questionnaire" to obtain faculty members' descriptions of their sabbatical and leave experiences, including reasons for not taking a sabbatical or leave as well as perceived benefits of taking a sabbatical or single

quarter leave. The questionnaire content was based on interviews with central academic officers, with deans of several of the colleges, and with a non-representative sample of department heads and faculty members. The questionnaire also included sections on other professional development activities of faculty (e.g., editorship of professional journal, visiting professorship, and convention attendance) and overall satisfaction with professional development opportunities.

Questionnaire Procedures

We sent questionnaires and explanatory cover letters during the week of May 10, 1982 to 3,038 faculty on the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota.[1] We sent a reminder to all faculty approximately four weeks later. The present analysis was based on responses of 1,510 faculty, or 49.7% of those who were sent questionnaires. Since a faculty member must be tenured to receive a sabbatical and either tenured or on a tenure track to receive a single quarter leave, a large number who received questionnaires did not qualify for sabbaticals or single quarter leaves and, presumably, did not complete the questionnaire. We received questionnaires from 1,168 tenured faculty, which represents about 80.8% of the estimated 1,500 tenured faculty on the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was primarily descriptive in nature. The analysis of institutional records consisted of calculating percentages of male and female awardees for each year during the past 13 years.

The questionnaire data analysis was only somewhat more complex. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each item on the Sabbatical and Single

---

[1]Because of on-going collective bargaining discussions with faculty on two of the coordinate campuses, legal restrictions prohibited collecting data from faculty on the campuses. Inadvertently, the Office of Addressing and Mailing also excluded faculty on two of the other coordinate campuses.

Quarter Leave Questionnaire. Comparisons between female and male respondents were either chi-square statistics or two sample t-tests for independent samples. Other comparisons among ranks (e.g., Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) were based on one-way analysis of variance.

Results

Institutional Records

The first set of results describes the relative frequencies of male and female awardees of sabbaticals and single quarter leaves during each of the past 13 years. Not surprisingly, the results in Table 1 clearly indicate that males have received a large proportion of the sabbaticals and leaves during each of the past years. What is of more interest, however, are the changes over the past two decades. The percentages of female and male awardees fluctuate considerably from year to year, and no clear trends are present. Moreover, the data are difficult to interpret without knowing the figures indicating the numbers of male and female faculty eligible for sabbaticals and quarter leaves during each of the years listed in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Characteristics Of Faculty Respondents

Obtaining summary statistics concerning characteristics for the total group of University faculty was not as easy as we hoped it would be and summary statistics were available for only a limited number of descriptive items. Table 2 compares questionnaire respondents and the total group of University faculty in terms of rank, sex, and tenure status. As the data in Table 2 indicate, the highest percentage of respondents (48.3%) were Professors. In comparison, statistics for the total group of University faculty indicate that 44.9% of the faculty are Professors. The comparisons between questionnaire

respondents and all faculty indicate that Professors were slightly over-represented in our study whereas Assistant Professors were slightly under-represented. Of the questionnaire respondents, 304 (20.3%) were female and 1,191 (79.7%) were male; comparable percentages for the total group of faculty are 18.9% and 81.1%, suggesting that females are slightly over represented in our sample. Questionnaire respondents were in approximately the same percentages as the total number of faculty members in the 18 colleges on the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Insert Table 2 about here

For our purposes, the question concerning the faculty members' tenure status was most important in our analysis of sabbatical and single quarter leave experiences. As the results in Table 2 indicate, the majority of respondents (N=1,168 or 78.3%) were tenured faculty members Another 182 faculty (12.2%) were on tenure-track positions but not yet tenured, and 129 (8.6%) were not on tenure-track positions. Another eight people said they were almost to be tenured, three were tenured elsewhere, and two noted some ambiguity about their tenure status. Those who were not on tenure-track positions were eliminated from most subsequent analyses.

In addition, years since tenure becomes an important variable in looking at a faculty members' sabbatical and single quarter leave experiences. Results contained in Table 2 indicate that the largest number of faculty were tenured 16 or more years (N=352, 30.7%). The average number of years since tenure was 12.3 years. Unfortunately, no comparison data are available for the total group of tenured faculty at the University. Number of years since PhD or highest degree is related to both tenure status and number of years since tenure. As the results in Table 2 indicate, the largest number of faculty

(N=283, 19.9%) received their PhD 11 to 15 years ago; the average years since PhD or highest degree was 16.5 (SD=9.28), and the modal number of years was 12 years since PhD.

When we compared female and male faculty respondents, we found differences in their rank and tenure status which need to be discussed in order to understand differences between the sabbatical and single quarter leave experiences of female and male faculty. Although there were differences across colleges in percentages of male versus female respondents (e.g., School of Nursing versus Institute of Technology) those differences are explainable in terms of differences in total number of male faculty. As results in Table 3 suggest, females accounted for 40.3% of the Assistant Professors and 14.9% of the Full Professors, compared to 16.7% and 56.7% for males. Of the 303 female respondents, 59.7% were tenured compared to 83.0% of the males. Male faculty respondents had completed their PhD's longer ago and had been tenured for a longer period of time than female faculty respondents. Finally, females differed from males in their primary University activity. The difference were greatest for "service and administration" (24.7% for females versus 13.8% for males), "very involved in teaching" (16.7% for females versus 7.7% for males), and "both teaching and research but more involved in research" (21.5% for females versus 37.8% for males).

Insert Table 3 about here

Sex Differences in Current Faculty Members' Use of Sabbatical and Leaves

Faculty members responded to a series of questions concerning whether or not they had taken a sabbatical or quarter leave and, if so, how many they had taken during their years at the University of Minnesota. As the results in Table 4 indicate, 38.8% of the males had taken a sabbatical in comparison to 30.8% of the females; the difference was statistically significant at $p \leq .05$. Of the

364 faculty who had taken a sabbatical, there was no difference between male and female faculty in the number of sabbaticals taken.

Insert Table 4 about here

We found a similar but slightly larger difference between male and female faculty in awards made for the competitive single quarter leave program. Of the eligible females, 33.3% had applied for and been awarded a single quarter leave in comparison to 43.9% for the eligible male faculty. There was also a difference between female and male faculty in number of leaves taken since the quarter leave program began in 1954.

Sex Differences in Perceived Benefits of Sabbaticals and Leaves

We asked faculty who had one or more sabbaticals or single quarter leaves to describe the benefits that resulted from the activity. As the results in Table 5 indicate, there were no statistically significant differences between female and male faculty in their responses to a list of ten possible benefits of taking a sabbatical (e.g., "Initiation of new scholarly activity"). Moreover, when we asked them to indicate which one of the ten benefits was most important to them, male and female faculty responded similarly.

Insert Table 5 about here

Similarly, we examined differences between female and male faculty in their descriptions of benefits of taking a single quarter leave and found statistically significant differences for four of the benefits. Results contained in Table 6 indicate that males frequently checked "completion of existing project" and "insights into my research" and females more frequently noted "expanded my intellectual horizons" and "other reasons".

Insert Table 6 about here

Sex Differences in Reasons For Not Taking Sabbatical or Leave

Faculty who had not taken a sabbatical or single quarter leave checked their reasons from lists of possible reasons (e.g., financial burden). Findings summarized in Table 7 indicate sex differences for seven of the reasons for not taking a sabbatical. Males were more likely to indicate "financial burden", "inconvenient for spouse", "inconvenient for children", "preference for stability", and "risked opportunities for grants" as reasons for not taking a sabbatical. Females more frequently checked "unable to get department heads' approval" and "discrimination" as reasons for not taking a sabbatical. Given the small number of faculty involved in these comparisons, caution interpretation of these differences is advisable. When asked to check which one of the reasons was most important, female and male faculty also differed in their responses.

Insert Table 7 about here

Female and male faculty also differed in their descriptions of reasons for not taking a single quarter leave. As noted in Table 8, female faculty were more likely to indicate "not yet eligible", "unable to get approval of my department head", and "my teaching load is so heavy" as reasons for not taking a single quarter leave. Male faculty were more likely to indicate "not overloaded by regular responsibilities", "sufficient freedom during regular academic year", and "personal preference for stability" as reasons for not taking a single quarter leave.

Insert Table 8 about here

Sex Differences in Other Professional Development Activities

Another set of twelve items asked faculty to indicate whether or not they had participated in various other professional development activities. We found some sex differences in participation in nine of the twelve other professional development activities. Female faculty were more likely than male faculty to have participated in formal continuing education experiences ($p \leq .001$). Males were more likely to have: "taken a leave of absence" ($p \leq .05$); "been an editor of a journal" ($p \leq .001$); "been an officer of an organization" ($p \leq .01$); "had a Fulbright" ($p \leq .001$); "had a small grant" ($p \leq .05$); "been a visiting professor" ($p \leq .001$); "had a summer research grant" ($p \leq .01$); and "had administrative experience" ($p \leq .01$). The differences are difficult to interpret because of the large differences in ranks of females versus males (e.g., 14.9% of the female respondents were Professors compared to 56.7% of the male respondents).

Finally, we compared female and male faculty in their overall satisfaction with opportunities for their professional growth and development. For this particular analysis, we looked at all male and female faculty who were either tenured or on tenure track positions. As the results in Table 9 indicate, females were significantly less satisfied than males. Table 9 also contains results of a comparison among Assistant, Associate and Full Professors in overall satisfaction with professional development opportunities. As the results indicate, there was a statistically significant difference ($p \leq .001$) suggesting that Professors were more satisfied than either Assistant or Associate Professors.

Insert Table 9 about here

Discussion

Consistent with much of the previous research on sex differences in higher education, the present study indicates some differences in faculty members use

of sabbaticals and quarter leaves at a major research university. The findings that a higher percentage of males than females had received both a non-competitive sabbatical as well as a competitive quarter leave is suggestive of the complexity of comparing female and male faculty members utilization of professional development opportunities offered by a particular institution.

Comparisons between male and female faculty in their reasons for not taking a sabbatical or quarter leave provide one basis for explanation. Some of the differences (e.g., a higher percentage of males than females indicating "inconvenient for spouse", "inconvenient for children") relate to the differing life patterns of male versus female faculty in higher education. Other differences relate (e.g., "unable to get my department heads' approval") more clearly to possible sex discrimination, although the number of individuals involved was quite small. Of more importance, however, are other items checked more frequently by female faculty (e.g., "my teaching load is so heavy") that relate more closely to a faculty members' work load. The differences here are confounded by the differences in rank, tenure status, and years since PhD which we found in comparing female and male faculty.

Although our data indicate some clear sex differences in utilization patterns for female versus male faculty, our data also indicate the absence of differences in faculty members' perceptions of the benefits of taking a sabbatical or quarter leave. In addition to demonstrating the absence of sex differences, these results contribute to the small body of evaluative research on sabbatical leaves in higher education (e.g., Steckler, 1965; Eberle & Thompson, 1973; Eels & Hollins, 1962). Additional research on both the outcome of sabbaticals, as well as sex differences in those outcomes, could benefit from analysis of other data sources (e.g., institutional records on research productivity and institutional contributions, faculty members' overall career path, and status within a faculty member's department.

References

Astin, H. S. & Bayer, A. E. Sex discrimination in academe. The Educational Record, May 1972.

Astin, H. S. & Hirsch, W. (Eds). Women: A challenge to higher education. New York: Praeger, 1979.

Bluhm, H. P. The sabbatical leave plan: Is it meeting faculty and institutional needs? Improving College & University Teaching, 1976, 24, 207-209.

Cooper, L. Sabbatical leave for college & teachers PhD dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1931.

Eberle, A. W. & Thompson, R. E. Sabbatical leaves in higher education. Indiana University: Student Association of Higher Education, 1973.

Entrekin, L. V. & Everett, J. E. Age and midcareer crisis: An emperial study of academics. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1981, 89, 84-97.

Eels, W. & Hollins, E. Sabbatical leave in American higher education. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education; Bulletin No. 17, 1962.

Goeres, E. R. Sabbatical, personal, maternity, and sick leave policies. Collective Bargaining Perspectives, 1977, 2, 10, West Virginia University: Morgantown, West Virginia.

Hopson, R. C. Sabbatical leaves in New Mexico colleges and universities. University of New Mexico: Albuquerque, 1972.

Jorgensen, V. F. Aspects of existing sabbatical leave policies with California Community Colleges. Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Doctor of Education degree.

Johnson, J. M. Professional leave fiscall 1979: Follow-up report. Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education: Olympia, WA, 1980.

Ladd, E. C. & Lipset, S. M. Sex differences in academe. Chronicle of Higher Education, May 10, 1976, p. 18.

LeGrand, D. & Swanson, H. L. A study of sabbatical leave practices in California public junior colleges. El Camino College: El Camino, California, 1964.

Lindsay, A. W. Institutional performance in higher education: The efficiency dimension. Review of Educational Research, 1982, 52, 175-199.

Palmer, D. D. & Patton, C. V. Mid-career change options in academe. Journal of Higher Education 1981, 52, 378-398.

Patton, B. R. Continued development of tenured faculty.Paper presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association. Anaheim CA: November 12-15, 1981.

Stickler, W. H. How 59 major institutions conduct faculty sabbatical leave programs. College and University Business, December 1965.

Toombs, W. Morlier, J. Career change among academics: Dimensions of decision. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA: April 13-17, 1981.

Table 1

Comparison of Number of Sabbaticals and Single Quarter Leaves Taken By Female and Male Faculty Members, 1969-70 to 1981-82[a]

Type / Year	Total N	Female		Male	
		N	%	N	%
Sabbaticals					
1969-70	51	10	19.6	41	80.4
1970-71	48	9	18.8	39	81.3
1971-72	70	5	7.1	65	92.9
1972-73	78	3	3.8	75	96.2
1973-74	47	4	8.5	43	91.5
1974-75	66	5	7.6	61	92.4
1975-76	81	10	12.3	71	87.7
1976-77	76	11	14.5	65	85.5
1977-78	98	11	11.2	87	88.8
1978-79	101	13	12.9	88	87.1
1979-80	96	13	13.5	83	86.5
1980-81	89	16	18.0	73	82.0
1981-82	88	10	11.4	78	88.6
Single Quarter Leave					
1969-70	86	7	8.1	79	91.9
1970-71	81	4	4.9	77	95.1
1971-72	94	17	18.1	77	81.9
1972-73	93	10	10.8	83	89.2
1973-74	110	10	9.1	100	90.9
1974-75	112	13	11.6	99	88.4
1975-76	113	14	12.4	99	87.6
1976-77	117	18	15.4	99	84.6
1977-78	121	16	13.2	105	86.8
1978-79	119	14	11.8	105	88.2
1979-80	112	15	13.4	97	86.6
1980-81	115	20	17.4	95	82.6
1981-82	114	26	22.8	88	77.2

[a]Derived from institutional records

Table 2

Comparison Between Questionnaire Respondents
and Total Group of University of Minnesota Faculty

Question Response	Questionnaire Respondents N	%	x	SD	Total University Faculty N	%
Rank	1494				1990	
Instructor	53	3.5			99	5.0
Assistant Professor	320	21.4			501	25.2
Associate Professor	391	26.2			496	24.9
Professor	721	48.3			894	44.9
Other	9	.6				
Sex	1495				1990	
Female	304	20.3			376	18.9
Male	1191	79.7			1614	81.1
Tenure Status	1492					
Not tenure track	129	8.6				
Tenure track	182	12.2				
Tenured	1168	78.3				
Other	13	.9				
Years Since Tenure	1148					
1-5 years	251	21.9	12.3	7.43		
6-10 years	294	25.6				
11-15 years	251	21.4				
16 or more years	352	30.7				
Years Since PhD	1425					
1-5 years	166	11.6	16.5	9.28		
6-10 years	260	18.2				
11-15 years	283	19.9				
16-20 years	275	19.3				
21-25 years	178	12.5				
26 or more years	263	18.5				

Table 3

Comparison Between Female and Male Respondents Relative to Rank, Tenure Status, Years Since Tenure and PhD, and Primary University Activity

Question	Female N	Female %	Female $\bar{x}$	Female SD	Male N	Male %	Male $\bar{x}$	Male SD	X^2	t-value
Rank	303				1179				234.44***	
Instructor	37	12.2			16	1.4				
Assistant Professor	122	40.3			197	16.7				
Associate Professor	97	32.0			290	24.6				
Professor	45	14.9			669	56.7				
Other	2	.7			7	.6				
Tenure Status	303				1179				85.70***	
Do not have tenure-track pos.	58	19.1			71	6.0				
Tenure track position	62	20.5			119	10.1				
Tenured	181	59.7			978	83.0				
Other	2	.7			11	.9				
Years since PhD	1416									
Female	281		12.14	8.40	1,135		17.52	9.19		-8.94***
Male										
Years since Tenure	1,144									
Female	174		9.06	6.43	970		12.81	7.90		-5.91***
Male										
Primary University Activity	275				1099				53.45***	
Service and administration	68	24.7			152	13.8				
Very involved in teaching	46	16.7			85	7.7				
Both T&R but more in teaching	94	34.2			398	36.2				
Both T&R but more in research	59	21.5			415	37.8				
Very involved in research	8	2.9			49	4.5				

*** $p \leq .001$

Table 4

Sex Difference in Current Faculty Members' Use of Sabbatical and Single Quarter Leave Options

Question Response	Males N	Males %	Females N	Females %	X^2
Sabbatical Taken	918[a] / 356	38.8	133[a] / 41	30.8	3.13*
Number of Sabbaticals	327		37		5.95
1	233	71.3	33	89.2	
2	72	22.0	4	10.8	
3-4	22	6.7	--	--	
Single Quarter Leave Taken	1074[b] / 471	43.9	225[b] / 75	33.3	8.45**
Number of Leaves	453		74		6.54*
1	289	63.8	58	78.4	
2	128	28.3	14	18.9	
3-5	36	7.9	2	2.7	

[a] Of the total group of respondents, 918 males and 133 females were eligible to take a sabbatical

[b] Of the total group of respondents, 1,074 males and 225 females were eligible to take a single quarter leave

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 5

Sex Differences in Faculty Members' Descriptions
of Benefits of Taking a Sabbatical

Benefit	Total		Males (N=356)		Females (N=41)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	X^2
	412						
Initiation of new scholarly activity (1)	310	75.2	269	75.6	31	75.6	.00
Continuation of existing project (2)	342	58.7	211	59.3	23	56.1	.15
Completion of existing project (3)	160	38.8	139	39.0	15	36.6	.09
Stimulated me to do more integration of my research with my teaching (4)	173	42.0	149	41.9	19	46.3	.30
Gave me the opportunity to refresh myself about new developments in my field (5)	296	71.8	252	70.8	33	80.5	1.71
Encouraged me to become more interdisciplinary (6)	163	39.6	141	39.6	15	36.6	.14
Gave me new perspectives on my teaching (7)	203	49.3	174	48.9	25	61.0	2.15
Gave me new perspectives on my research (8)	292	70.9	253	71.1	30	73.2	.08
Expanded my intellectual horizons (9)	314	76.2	271	76.1	31	75.6	.01
Gave me a break from teaching and/or administration (10)	304	74.1	259	73.2	34	82.9	1.83

Table 6

Sex Differences in Faculty Members' Descriptions of Benefits of Taking a Single Quarter Leave

Benefit	Total N	Total %	Males (N=471) N	Males (N=471) %	Females (N=75) N	Females (N=75) %	X^2
	572						
Initiation of new scholarly activity (1)	349	61.2	295	62.9	42	56.0	1.31
Continuation of existing project (2)	357	62.4	289	61.4	51	68.0	1.21
Completion of existing project (3)	234	40.9	199	42.3	22	29.3	4.48*
Stimulated me to do more integration of my research with my teaching (4)	205	35.8	167	35.5	29	38.7	.29
Gave me the opportunity to refresh myself about new developments in my field (5)	354	61.9	295	62.6	44	58.7	.42
Encouraged me to become more interdisciplinary (6)	155	27.1	128	27.2	19	25.3	.11
Gave me new perspectives on my teaching (7)	214	37.4	172	36.5	32	42.7	1.05
Gave me new perspectives on my research (8)	387	67.7	328	69.6	43	57.3	4.50*
Expanded my intellectual horizons (9)	346	60.5	278	59.0	54	72.0	4.57*
Gave me a break from teaching and/or administration (10)	360	62.9	295	62.6	49	65.3	.20

* $p \leq .05$

Table 7

Sex Differences in Faculty Members' Descriptions
Of Reasons For Not Taking A Sabbatical

Reason	Total		Males		Females		X^2
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
	748						
Not yet eligible for sabbatical (1)	104	13.9	75	13.3	17	18.5	1.72
I have not felt overloaded with teaching and/or administrative responsibilities	50	6.7	39	6.9	5	5.4	.29
My faculty position has had sufficient freedom to pursue scholarly interests during the regular academic year (3)	101	13.5	84	14.9	10	10.9	1.07
Taking a sabbatical would have negatively affected my scholarly productivity (4)	46	6.1	41	7.3	3	3.3	2.05
The financial burden of living on half-salary was too great (5)	484	64.7	384	68.3	47	51.1	10.46**
Unable to make arrangements for appropriate sabbatical activity (6)	110	14.7	84	14.9	9	9.8	1.73
Inconvenient for my spouse (7)	193	25.8	160	28.5	11	12.0	11.16**
Inconvenient for my child(ren) (8)	222	29.7	197	35.1	8	8.7	25.52**
Unable to find suitable housing while away (9)	10	1.3	8	1.4	1	1.1	.07
Unable to leave my current home residence for several months (10)	112	15.0	80	14.2	15	16.3	.27
Personal preference is for stability rather than "uprooting" experiences of being gone for a year (11)	106	14.2	84	14.9	5	5.4	6.08*
Peer pressure not to take a sabbatical (12)	54	7.2	39	6.9	8	8.7	.37
Unable to prepare a proposal that has been received favorably by my department head (13)	7	.9	4	.7	1	1.1	.15
Unable to get approval of my department head (14)	12	1.6	7	1.2	4	4.3	4.60*
Too busy to make applications/arrangements for sabbatical (15)	194	25.9	143	25.4	26	28.3	.33
Facilities to do my research are here so I am unable to go elsewhere (16)	22	2.9	16	2.8	2	2.2	.13
My teaching load is so heavy that substitutes cannot be found (17)	58	7.8	43	7.7	11	12.0	1.93
My area is so specialized that no one else can teach my courses (18)	41	5.5	32	5.7	4	4.3	.27
My department couldn't make arrangements to cover my work load (19)	88	11.8	57	10.1	14	15.2	2.10
Leaving for a year risks my opportunities for grants and research funding (20)	68	9.1	64	11.4	4	4.3	4.21*
I have been discriminated against because of my age/gender/race (21)	3	.4	1	.2	2	2.2	6.90
I am unaware of how to proceed in requesting a sabbatical (22)	18	2.4	12	2.1	1	1.1	.45
I cannot be away from my graduate advisees for so long (23)	49	6.6	44	7.8	4	4.3	1.41

* $p \leq .05$

*** $p \leq .001$

Table 8

Sex Differences In Faculty Members' Descriptions
Of Reasons For Not Taking A Single Quarter Leave

Reason	Total		Males		Females		X^2
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
	787						
Not yet eligible for single quarter leave (1)	135	17.2	85	14.1	35	23.3	7.65**
I have not felt overloaded by regular teaching and/or administrative responsibilities (2)	91	11.6	80	13.3	7	4.7	8.69**
Unable to make arrangements for appropriate leave activity (3)	170	21.6	130	21.6	38	25.3	.99
My faculty position has had sufficient freedom to pursue scholarly interests during the regular academic year (4)	149	18.9	130	21.6	16	10.7	9.12**
Unable to come up with an acceptable plan for what I would accomplish during a single quarter leave (5)	109	13.9	89	14.8	15	10.0	2.29
Personal preference is for stability and continuity (6)	110	14.0	96	15.9	11	7.3	7.27**
Have applied but never been granted a single quarter leave (7)	62	7.9	48	8.0	13	8.7	.08
Peer pressure not to take a single quarter leave (8)	45	5.7	33	5.5	12	8.0	1.37
Unable to prepare a proposal that has been viewed favorably by my department head (9)	15	1.9	14	2.3	1	.7	1.69
Unable to get the approval of my department head (10)	12	1.5	6	1.0	6	4.0	6.92**
Too busy to make applications/arrangements for single quarter leave (11)	300	38.1	229	38.0	61	40.7	.37
My teaching load is so heavy that substitutes cannot be found (12)	59	7.5	40	6.6	18	12.0	4.87*
My area is so specialized that no one else can teach my courses (13)	44	5.6	33	5.5	10	6.7	.32
My department couldn't make arrangements to cover my workload (14)	87	11.1	65	10.8	19	12.7	.43
I have been discriminated against because of my age/gender/race (15)	7	.9	4	.7	2	1.3	.68
I am unaware of procedures for applying for a single quarter leave (16)	60	7.6	43	7.1	12	8.0	.13

* $p \leq .05$
** $p \leq .01$
*** $p \leq .001$

Table 9

Faculty Members' Satisfaction With Opportunities
For Professional Growth At The University Of Minnesota:
Total Group of Faculty Respondents and By Rank and Sex

	Total (N=1474)		Sex[a]				Ranked Tenure and Tenure Track (N=1311)[b]					
			Female		Male		Assistant (N=225)		Associate (N=365)		Professor (N=675)	
Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
			235		1078							
Very dissatisfied	47	3.2	11	4.7	28	2.6	13	5.8	12	3.3	11	1.6
Dissatisfied	241	16.4	48	20.4	162	15.0	38	16.9	76	20.8	86	12.4
Neutral	280	19.0	[illegible]	18.7	200	18.6	51	22.7	78	21.4	111	16.0
Satisfied	717	48.6	108	46.0	533	49.4	105	46.7	169	46.3	362	52.1
Very Satisfied	189	12.8	24	10.2	155	14.4	18	8.0	30	8.2	125	18.0
$\bar{x}$	3.54		3.30		3.57		3.34		3.35		3.72	
SD	1.01		1.06		.99		1.04		1.00		/95	

[b]Results of a one-way analysis of variance among Assistant, Associate and Full Professors was statistically significant ($F = 13.15$, $p \leq .001$)

[a]Results of a F test comparing males and females was statistically significant ($F = 16.9$>, $p \leq .001$).